

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application and stand rejected.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C §103

Claims 1-19 continue to stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 5,978,673 to Alperovich et al. in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,587,688 to Chambers. In reply to Applicant's previous arguments to the contrary, the Examiner notes that Applicant does not claim that the RNM is adapted to allocate a local mobile phone number from a pool of local mobile phone numbers in the contracted roaming network for the *phone* but rather for the *subscriber*. Responsive to the Examiner's comment, Applicant has hereby amended the claims to specifically recite that the RNM is adapted to allocate a local mobile phone number from a pool of local mobile phone numbers in the contracted roaming network for the *phone*. In view of these amendments, Applicant reiterates his previous assertion that Alperovich does not disclose the claimed elements noted by the Examiner.

The present invention relates to a network and a method for providing for roaming to a mobile subscriber, whereas Alperovich relates to location-based call forwarding within a Public Land Mobile Network. One of ordinary skilled in the art of mobile communications knows that roaming and call forwarding are two very different services and techniques in both principle and implementation, and would appreciate that Alperovich and the present invention belong in two different technical fields. Specific, distinct differences between the two are discussed below.

Presently amended claim 1 recites that "the RNM is adapted to allocate a local mobile phone number from a pool of local mobile phone numbers in the contracted roaming network for the phone.....wherein the allocated local mobile phone number is adapted to be utilized to process an incoming call or an outgoing call in the contracted roaming network." Thus, the local mobile phone number in the contracted roaming network is allocated for the mobile terminal held by the subscriber (the subscriber's phone). In other words, the mobile terminal held by the subscriber corresponds to two phone numbers: a phone number in its home network, and another,

allocated local mobile phone number in the current roaming network. With the local number, the subscriber can enjoy local subscriber treatment in contracted roaming network. For instance, when called at this local number, voice traffic can be delivered and established directly to the network in the roaming area rather than through the subscriber's home network, resulting in lower usage charges incurred by the roaming subscriber. Alperovich, on the other hand, discloses a location-based call-forwarding method. Call forwarding is a service wherein a call to a number (identifying a terminal/subscriber) is re-directed to another number that was specified by the called subscriber. In the method of Alperovich, the subscriber specifies different numbers for different service areas to which calls should be forwarded. In this manner, depending on the subscriber's location (service area), incoming calls are forwarded to different numbers. As one of ordinary skill would understand, the location-based call forward-to numbers taught by Alperovich are different from the mobile phone number of the subscriber (to which the call is originally placed) and correspond to other telecommunication terminals/subscribers which may be land lines and/or mobile phones and which may not necessarily be in a roaming service area (please see column 5, lines 32-34 of Alperovich). Thus, in the system of Alperovich one mobile terminal does not correspond to multiple phone numbers as presently claimed.

Furthermore, in the present invention the local phone number in roaming network is allocated by a Roaming number manager (RNM) operated and managed by the service provider. In Alperovich, the location-based call forwarding-to-number in the service area (the contracted roaming network) is selected prior, i.e. it is predetermined, by the mobile subscriber (please see column 7, lines 33-35 of Alperovich).

Finally, Applicant notes that in his invention, the allocated local phone number in a roaming network can be used by the mobile subscriber in roaming for placing an outgoing call or receiving an incoming call. In Alperovich, the predetermined location-based call forwarding-to-number is a number identifying another subscriber (whether land line or mobile station) than the original called number (terminal subscriber), and as such can only be used for re-directing an incoming call (please see column 4, lines 66-67 of Alperovich).

Thus, as detailed above, Applicant submits that Alperovich does not in fact teach the presently claimed limitation of "the RNM is adapted to allocate a local mobile phone number from a pool of local mobile phone numbers in the contracted roaming network for the

phone...wherein the allocated local mobile phone number is adapted to be utilized to process an incoming call or an outgoing call in the contracted roaming network."

With regards to Chambers, Applicant notes that although this reference also teaches allocating a local phone number from a pool of local phone numbers in a roaming network for a subscriber, this local mobile phone number refers to a temporary local directory number (TLDN) that is assigned to the roaming subscriber by the visited MSC (please see column 3, lines 40-42 of Chambers). The TLDN allocation is a procedure well known in the art of mobile communication, in which the TLDN is assigned to the roaming subscriber for routing an incoming call to the roaming subscriber. The TLDN is a temporary number valid only in an MSC/VLR scope, with a short life time as it is valid only for the routing period and which is released when the call is routed to the visited MSC. The TLDN is only used by the network entity and invisible to both the calling and called parties. It is allocated by a visited MSC/VLR on a per call basis and changes with each call. This is in contrast with the present invention, in which the local mobile phone number in the contracted roaming network is allocated to the roaming subscriber phone when the subscriber is roaming in the contracted roaming network. The local mobile phone number can always be utilized by the subscriber in the contracted roaming network for receiving an incoming call or initiating an outgoing call until the subscriber leaves the roaming network, at which time the allocated number is released.

Applicant further notes that in Chambers the TLDN is assigned by the visited MSC, whereas in the present invention the local mobile phone number is allocated by the RNM connected with the HLR.

Applicant does acknowledge TLDN allocation is also used in the present invention. When routing information is requested from the HLR, the HLR obtains routing information by accessing the VLR in the roaming network, which is then used to establish the call to serving MSC (see pages 14, lines 6-13, of the specification). The thus-obtained routing information is mainly TDNs. Applicant thus submits that clearly, the local mobile phone number allocated in the roaming network of the present invention plays a very different role from that of the TLDN in Chambers.

In view of all of the preceding, Applicant respectfully submits the independent claim 1 is novel and non-obvious over the art on record and request the Examiner to kindly reconsider and withdraw the final rejection.

Claims 2-19 depend from claim 1. "If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious." *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, in light of the above discussion of claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 2-19 are also allowable at least in view of their dependency on claim 1.

Regarding the prior art made of record by the Examiner but not relied upon, Applicant believes that this art does not render the pending claims unpatentable.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully urges the Examiner to pass this case to issue.

* * *

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert Popa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 43,010
LADAS & PARRY
5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100
Los Angeles, California 90036
(323) 934-2300 voice
(323) 934-0202 facsimile
rpopa@la.ladas.com